

Mr. JAMES ELLIOTT is authorized to receive and receipt for subscriptions and advertisements for the Daily and the Weekly National Era, in Cincinnati and vicinity.

## WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 1854.

## THE GREAT DEBATE IN THE SENATE.

We present the telegraphic report in the Tribune, of the debate in the Senate, on the presentation of the memorial from Massachusetts against the Fugitive Slave Act. It is condensed, but very graphic. Slaveholding Senators undertook, in their usual style, to browbeat Mr. Sumner; and Mr. Pettib who misrepresents Indiana, was impotent enough to imitate them.

Yesterday, the debate was resumed, and Mr. Sumner made a speech which has given an unequalled immortality to Senators Butler and Mason. These gentlemen, mistaking the character of Mr. Sumner, had gone too far in their rude and domineering deportment towards the Senator, and his terrible rebuke and incentive will be likely to put them on their guard hereafter. We shall publish the speech as soon as reported, which will make the gentlemen more widely known than any of their own efforts.

## THE ADMINISTRATION AND ITS SUPPORTERS.

We see no indication of a general disposition among the leaders of what is styled the Democratic party in the free States, to put the claims of Freedom above Party, and unite with their fellow-citizens of other parties in a common movement to turn back the tide of Slavery-aggression. Having brought the present Administration into power, they seem determined to sustain it during the rest of its term, as the bond of union in an organization which they regard as permanently dominant. With the exception of the mercenary, the more soldiers of fortune, the marketable men, always ready to do the dirtiest work for even less than Judas got for his treason, those leaders were displeased at the introduction of the Nebraska bill; many of them openly opposed it; some worked hard against it; few were willing to hold up the Administration conspicuously, as responsible for it, or to break with it on account of it; and, since its passage, the majority of them evidently incline tacitly or explicitly to acquiesce in it, and continue their support of the Administration, as if it had signally itself by active conformity to Democratic Principles, instead of uniform hostility to them, and base submission to a Class Interest. Let us recall a few facts:—

In Ohio, the leaders, whatever their private sentiments, prevented any legislative expression of opinion on the Nebraska Bill, or the Pro-Slavery policy of the Administration. In such a case, not to condemn was to approve. They went still further, and secured the election of a Calhoun Pro-Slavery Senator, as the successor of Mr. Chase—a man who subsequently proclaimed himself an advocate of the Bill.

In PENNSYLVANIA, they have attempted a similar policy. Their Convention, held while the Bill was under discussion in Congress, was afraid to condemn or approve, fearing the People on one side, the President on the other. And its candidate for the office of Governor is trying to carry out the same policy. But, nearly all the Administration members of Congress from Pennsylvania, and nearly all the Administration journals in that State, including those supposed to speak particularly the sentiments of Mr. Bigler, have given the Bill their support.

In these two States, the Administration Party may now be regarded as committed openly to the maintenance of the Bill as it has passed, and to the entire Pro-Slavery policy of the Federal Executive.

In CONNECTICUT, as we know, the leaders attempted to be very unconvincing, passing resolutions in the State Convention, in favor of all the Compromises, including that of 1820 and that of 1850—but the "wooden nutmeg" trick deceived nobody; the Democrats abandoned the Administration Party, so that it was able to send little more than a corporal's guard to the Legislature.

In NEW HAMPSHIRE, it is true, they refused to make the Bill a test in the March election—some had the hardihood to assert that the President was not in favor of it—the central organ in Washington helped them in their game of deception, by denying that it was to be considered an issue—the result was the return of a nominal Administration majority to the Legislature, but, as its proceedings thus far prove, a real Anti-Nebraska majority.

These are specimens of the policy of the leaders of the so-called Democratic Party, or more correctly, the Administration Party, before the passage of the Bill. It was insidious, evasive, non-committal, or two-faced, just to suit circumstances.

But, since the passage of the Bill, the leaders generally have become bolder, and now demand positive approbation, or acquiescence, express or tacit, according to circumstances. And the Administration is everywhere busy, laboring to ally discontent, and reconcile its supporters to what, it is now said, must be regarded as a fact accomplished. "Let the past be forgotten," it says. "There shall be no proscription on account of past opposition to the Bill, provided it now be quietly assented to. And, what have you to gain by further agitation? If you prostrate us, where are you? You cannot act with the Abolitionists—you cannot expect anything from the Whigs—you are not strong enough to form an organization of your own. Separate yourselves from us, and you only put power into the hands of your old enemies, the Whigs, whose policy in regard to Slavery you dislike as much as you do ours, while in other respects you agree with us, and disagree with them. Make up your mind, if you cannot sanction what is done, at least to acquiesce in it, and forbear further agitation. Thus shall we continue a united, harmonious Party, in the permanent possession of the Government, with its policy, patronage, and appointments, at our disposal."

Such is substantially the language of the Administration, and the considerations it urges are producing their intended effect.

Of the Democratic members from Indiana, for example, who were opposed to the Bill, but one, we apprehend, will have firmness and integrity enough to resist such appeals. And, at a packed Convention in that State, as we have seen, the Nebraska Bill, its Principle, and the Policy it indicates, have been endorsed in the strongest terms.

Since then, State Conventions of Administration supporters, calling themselves the Democratic party, have been held in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. That of New Hampshire was held at Concord, on the 15th, and we copy the resolutions adopted, as they probably embody the plan of the Administration for restoring harmony among its followers. It is no new thing that resolutions should be prepared at Washington, and sent to the States for adoption. The resolutions of the New Hampshire Legislature, or State Democratic Convention, in 1845, in relation to Texas, were drafted, we are told, by John C. Calhoun, transcribed by Levi Woodbury, and despatched to the emissaries of the Administration in New Hampshire.

The resolutions, then, which follow, we presume are the handiwork of the Pierce Administration, and, as such, we publish them:

"Resolved, That the Democracy of New Hampshire adhere as firmly as ever to the platform adopted at the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore, on which the last Presidential election was so triumphantly fought and won; and that we shall preserve with increased fervor our former devotion to the Constitution, Union, and our unabated hostility to all parties and all factions that would alienate the affections of the people from those great bonds of our national liberty and prosperity."

"Resolved, That the right to regulate their domestic institutions for themselves within their own limits, ought to be enjoyed by the people of the States and Territories of the country; that the Compromise acts of 1850 substantially recognized the justice of this principle, which has at length been made uniform in its operations in the recent action of Congress in passing the bill for the organization of Kansas and Nebraska."

"Resolved, That the administration of Franklin Pierce has been directed by high, pure, and national considerations, and has exhibited proofs of a wise, liberal, and patriotic policy; that it has shown itself true to the great principle of Jefferson and the early leaders of the Democracy of the country; and therefore we continue to repose in it the most unlimited confidence, and entertain for it, and especially for its distinguished head, the warmest feelings of attachment and regard."

There was another resolution, which has slipped from our table, declaring that whatever differences of opinion may have existed among Democrats concerning the expediency of the Bill, when under discussion, now that it is passed, all should acquiesce in it, &c.

The leaders in Vermont, at the State Administration Convention that met on the 21st June, secured the adoption of the same resolutions, substantially. We have at hand now only a synopsis of them, given by a Democratic correspondent of the New York Evening Post, as follows:

"The resolutions, all of any significance, go to establish the following positions:

"1st. The unshaken confidence of the Convention in the administration of Gen. Pierce."

"2d. The non-intervention principle, asserted by the Compromises of 1850 and carried out in the Nebraska bill, is a true Democratic doctrine."

"3d. But, owing to difference of opinion, the support of the Nebraska bill not to be made a test among Democrats, but all to be left free to enjoy and express their opinions of the measure, without affecting their party standing."

"4th. A condemnation of sectional issues, and of the platform of the recent Whig Convention."

Parties in Maine have been so disorganized by the Temperance Question, that it requires considerable circumspection to define them.

The real Democracy, as we have already announced, met in Convention on the 7th inst., adopted Temperance and Anti-Slavery resolves, and nominated a candidate for the office of Governor, representing the policy they indicated. On the 15th, the "Wild Cats," schismatics from the Democracy, met in State Convention in Portland, resolved against the Maine Law, and in favor of the Nebraska Bill, and made their nominations accordingly. On the 21st, the Hunkers, Administration men proper, assembled in Convention at the same place, nominated Albion K. Parris for Governor, and declining to express any opinion on Temperance or the Nebraska Bill, adjourned, after having passed a single resolution as follows:

"Resolved, That this Convention do now adjourn, to meet their fellow Democrats at the polls, and elect Hon. Albion K. Parris Governor of this State for the ensuing year."

In all these States, except Maine, the leaders of what once was the Democratic Party, march boldly up to the question, endorse the Nebraska integrity, and warmly applaud an Administration, whose career, unmarked by a single Democratic measure, is stamped at every step with utter subservience to Slavery. In Maine, the leaders seek to dodge responsibility by passing no resolutions for or against the Nebraska Bill; but there can be little doubt that they have nominated a candidate committed to the Administration, and that they intend to acquiesce in the outrage inflicted on the free States.

A correspondent of the New York Tribune, writing from Washington, June 25th, says of Mr. Parris:

"It is generally believed here, that when he was in this city a few weeks ago, he spoke approvingly of that measure, and took credit to himself for having discouraged a meeting of the citizens of Portland to protest against it."

So much for Conventional action, as indicating the policy of the leaders of the party that elected the nullifier of the Missouri Compromise.

Let us glance at their policy, as disclosed in the conduct of their prominent journals. We have nothing to say of the "ox that knoweth its owner, or of the ass that loveth its master's crib"—nothing of that tribe of creatures that peddle the praises of the President, for a price. Our business is with respectable journalists, who have shown their respect for Principle by condemning the Nebraska Bill, but may now show their regard for Party, by inculcating or practicing acquiescence.

The Augusta (Me.) Age is one of these, and represents the Hunkers of that State, who have nominated Mr. Parris. It condemned the Nebraska Bill, but, on the ground, chiefly, that it violated the Baltimore Platform, and re-opened the agitation of Slavery. Still more lately it denounced the Washington Union, for insisting upon adhesion to the Bill, as a test of Democracy. Commenting some time since on its

tegrity enough to resist such appeals. And, at a packed Convention in that State, as we have seen, the Nebraska Bill, its Principle, and the Policy it indicates, have been endorsed in the strongest terms.

Since then, State Conventions of Administration supporters, calling themselves the Democratic party, have been held in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. That of New Hampshire was held at Concord, on the 15th, and we copy the resolutions adopted, as they probably embody the plan of the Administration for restoring harmony among its followers. It is no new thing that resolutions should be prepared at Washington, and sent to the States for adoption. The resolutions of the New Hampshire Legislature, or State Democratic Convention, in 1845, in relation to Texas, were drafted, we are told, by John C. Calhoun, transcribed by Levi Woodbury, and despatched to the emissaries of the Administration in New Hampshire.

The resolutions, then, which follow, we presume are the handiwork of the Pierce Administration, and, as such, we publish them:

"Resolved, That the Democracy of New Hampshire adhere as firmly as ever to the platform adopted at the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore, on which the last Presidential election was so triumphantly fought and won; and that we shall preserve with increased fervor our former devotion to the Constitution, Union, and our unabated hostility to all parties and all factions that would alienate the affections of the people from those great bonds of our national liberty and prosperity."

"Resolved, That the right to regulate their domestic institutions for themselves within their own limits, ought to be enjoyed by the people of the States and Territories of the country; that the Compromise acts of 1850 substantially recognized the justice of this principle, which has at length been made uniform in its operations in the recent action of Congress in passing the bill for the organization of Kansas and Nebraska."

"Resolved, That the administration of Franklin Pierce has been directed by high, pure, and national considerations, and has exhibited proofs of a wise, liberal, and patriotic policy; that it has shown itself true to the great principle of Jefferson and the early leaders of the Democracy of the country; and therefore we continue to repose in it the most unlimited confidence, and entertain for it, and especially for its distinguished head, the warmest feelings of attachment and regard."

There was another resolution, which has slipped from our table, declaring that whatever differences of opinion may have existed among Democrats concerning the expediency of the Bill, when under discussion, now that it is passed, all should acquiesce in it, &c.

The leaders in Vermont, at the State Administration Convention that met on the 21st June, secured the adoption of the same resolutions, substantially. We have at hand now only a synopsis of them, given by a Democratic correspondent of the New York Evening Post, as follows:

"The resolutions, all of any significance, go to establish the following positions:

"1st. The unshaken confidence of the Convention in the administration of Gen. Pierce."

"2d. The non-intervention principle, asserted by the Compromises of 1850 and carried out in the Nebraska bill, is a true Democratic doctrine."

"3d. But, owing to difference of opinion, the support of the Nebraska bill not to be made a test among Democrats, but all to be left free to enjoy and express their opinions of the measure, without affecting their party standing."

"4th. A condemnation of sectional issues, and of the platform of the recent Whig Convention."

Parties in Maine have been so disorganized by the Temperance Question, that it requires considerable circumspection to define them.

The real Democracy, as we have already announced, met in Convention on the 7th inst., adopted Temperance and Anti-Slavery resolves, and nominated a candidate for the office of Governor, representing the policy they indicated. On the 15th, the "Wild Cats," schismatics from the Democracy, met in State Convention in Portland, resolved against the Maine Law, and in favor of the Nebraska Bill, and made their nominations accordingly. On the 21st, the Hunkers, Administration men proper, assembled in Convention at the same place, nominated Albion K. Parris for Governor, and declining to express any opinion on Temperance or the Nebraska Bill, adjourned, after having passed a single resolution as follows:

"Resolved, That this Convention do now adjourn, to meet their fellow Democrats at the polls, and elect Hon. Albion K. Parris Governor of this State for the ensuing year."

In all these States, except Maine, the leaders of what once was the Democratic Party, march boldly up to the question, endorse the Nebraska integrity, and warmly applaud an Administration, whose career, unmarked by a single Democratic measure, is stamped at every step with utter subservience to Slavery. In Maine, the leaders seek to dodge responsibility by passing no resolutions for or against the Nebraska Bill; but there can be little doubt that they have nominated a candidate committed to the Administration, and that they intend to acquiesce in the outrage inflicted on the free States.

A correspondent of the New York Tribune, writing from Washington, June 25th, says of Mr. Parris:

"It is generally believed here, that when he was in this city a few weeks ago, he spoke approvingly of that measure, and took credit to himself for having discouraged a meeting of the citizens of Portland to protest against it."

So much for Conventional action, as indicating the policy of the leaders of the party that elected the nullifier of the Missouri Compromise.

Let us glance at their policy, as disclosed in the conduct of their prominent journals. We have nothing to say of the "ox that knoweth its owner, or of the ass that loveth its master's crib"—nothing of that tribe of creatures that peddle the praises of the President, for a price. Our business is with respectable journalists, who have shown their respect for Principle by condemning the Nebraska Bill, but may now show their regard for Party, by inculcating or practicing acquiescence.

The Augusta (Me.) Age is one of these, and represents the Hunkers of that State, who have nominated Mr. Parris. It condemned the Nebraska Bill, but, on the ground, chiefly, that it violated the Baltimore Platform, and re-opened the agitation of Slavery. Still more lately it denounced the Washington Union, for insisting upon adhesion to the Bill, as a test of Democracy. Commenting some time since on its

tegrity enough to resist such appeals. And, at a packed Convention in that State, as we have seen, the Nebraska Bill, its Principle, and the Policy it indicates, have been endorsed in the strongest terms.

Since then, State Conventions of Administration supporters, calling themselves the Democratic party, have been held in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. That of New Hampshire was held at Concord, on the 15th, and we copy the resolutions adopted, as they probably embody the plan of the Administration for restoring harmony among its followers. It is no new thing that resolutions should be prepared at Washington, and sent to the States for adoption. The resolutions of the New Hampshire Legislature, or State Democratic Convention, in 1845, in relation to Texas, were drafted, we are told, by John C. Calhoun, transcribed by Levi Woodbury, and despatched to the emissaries of the Administration in New Hampshire.

tegrity enough to resist such appeals. And, at a packed Convention in that State, as we have seen, the Nebraska Bill, its Principle, and the Policy it indicates, have been endorsed in the strongest terms.

Since then, State Conventions of Administration supporters, calling themselves the Democratic party, have been held in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. That of New Hampshire was held at Concord, on the 15th, and we copy the resolutions adopted, as they probably embody the plan of the Administration for restoring harmony among its followers. It is no new thing that resolutions should be prepared at Washington, and sent to the States for adoption. The resolutions of the New Hampshire Legislature, or State Democratic Convention, in 1845, in relation to Texas, were drafted, we are told, by John C. Calhoun, transcribed by Levi Woodbury, and despatched to the emissaries of the Administration in New Hampshire.

The resolutions, then, which follow, we presume are the handiwork of the Pierce Administration, and, as such, we publish them:

"Resolved, That the Democracy of New Hampshire adhere as firmly as ever to the platform adopted at the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore, on which the last Presidential election was so triumphantly fought and won; and that we shall preserve with increased fervor our former devotion to the Constitution, Union, and our unabated hostility to all parties and all factions that would alienate the affections of the people from those great bonds of our national liberty and prosperity."

"Resolved, That the right to regulate their domestic institutions for themselves within their own limits, ought to be enjoyed by the people of the States and Territories of the country; that the Compromise acts of 1850 substantially recognized the justice of this principle, which has at length been made uniform in its operations in the recent action of Congress in passing the bill for the organization of Kansas and Nebraska."

"Resolved, That the administration of Franklin Pierce has been directed by high, pure, and national considerations, and has exhibited proofs of a wise, liberal, and patriotic policy; that it has shown itself true to the great principle of Jefferson and the early leaders of the Democracy of the country; and therefore we continue to repose in it the most unlimited confidence, and entertain for it, and especially for its distinguished head, the warmest feelings of attachment and regard."

There was another resolution, which has slipped from our table, declaring that whatever differences of opinion may have existed among Democrats concerning the expediency of the Bill, when under discussion, now that it is passed, all should acquiesce in it, &c.

The leaders in Vermont, at the State Administration Convention that met on the 21st June, secured the adoption of the same resolutions, substantially. We have at hand now only a synopsis of them, given by a Democratic correspondent of the New York Evening Post, as follows:

"The resolutions, all of any significance, go to establish the following positions:

"1st. The unshaken confidence of the Convention in the administration of Gen. Pierce."

"2d. The non-intervention principle, asserted by the Compromises of 1850 and carried out in the Nebraska bill, is a true Democratic doctrine."

"3d. But, owing to difference of opinion, the support of the Nebraska bill not to be made a test among Democrats, but all to be left free to enjoy and express their opinions of the measure, without affecting their party standing."

"4th. A condemnation of sectional issues, and of the platform of the recent Whig Convention."

Parties in Maine have been so disorganized by the Temperance Question, that it requires considerable circumspection to define them.

The real Democracy, as we have already announced, met in Convention on the 7th inst., adopted Temperance and Anti-Slavery resolves, and nominated a candidate for the office of Governor, representing the policy they indicated. On the 15th, the "Wild Cats," schismatics from the Democracy, met in State Convention in Portland, resolved against the Maine Law, and in favor of the Nebraska Bill, and made their nominations accordingly. On the 21st, the Hunkers, Administration men proper, assembled in Convention at the same place, nominated Albion K. Parris for Governor, and declining to express any opinion on Temperance or the Nebraska Bill, adjourned, after having passed a single resolution as follows:

"Resolved, That this Convention do now adjourn, to meet their fellow Democrats at the polls, and elect Hon. Albion K. Parris Governor of this State for the ensuing year."

In all these States, except Maine, the leaders of what once was the Democratic Party, march boldly up to the question, endorse the Nebraska integrity, and warmly applaud an Administration, whose career, unmarked by a single Democratic measure, is stamped at every step with utter subservience to Slavery. In Maine, the leaders seek to dodge responsibility by passing no resolutions for or against the Nebraska Bill; but there can be little doubt that they have nominated a candidate committed to the Administration, and that they intend to acquiesce in the outrage inflicted on the free States.

A correspondent of the New York Tribune, writing from Washington, June 25th, says of Mr. Parris:

"It is generally believed here, that when he was in this city a few weeks ago, he spoke approvingly of that measure, and took credit to himself for having discouraged a meeting of the citizens of Portland to protest against it."

So much for Conventional action, as indicating the policy of the leaders of the party that elected the nullifier of the Missouri Compromise.

Let us glance at their policy, as disclosed in the conduct of their prominent journals. We have nothing to say of the "ox that knoweth its owner, or of the ass that loveth its master's crib"—nothing of that tribe of creatures that peddle the praises of the President, for a price. Our business is with respectable journalists, who have shown their respect for Principle by condemning the Nebraska Bill, but may now show their regard for Party, by inculcating or practicing acquiescence.

The Augusta (Me.) Age is one of these, and represents the Hunkers of that State, who have nominated Mr. Parris. It condemned the Nebraska Bill, but, on the ground, chiefly, that it violated the Baltimore Platform, and re-opened the agitation of Slavery. Still more lately it denounced the Washington Union, for insisting upon adhesion to the Bill, as a test of Democracy. Commenting some time since on its

tegrity enough to resist such appeals. And, at a packed Convention in that State, as we have seen, the Nebraska Bill, its Principle, and the Policy it indicates, have been endorsed in the strongest terms.

Since then, State Conventions of Administration supporters, calling themselves the Democratic party, have been held in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. That of New Hampshire was held at Concord, on the 15th, and we copy the resolutions adopted, as they probably embody the plan of the Administration for restoring harmony among its followers. It is no new thing that resolutions should be prepared at Washington, and sent to the States for adoption. The resolutions of the New Hampshire Legislature, or State Democratic Convention, in 1845, in relation to Texas, were drafted, we are told, by John C. Calhoun, transcribed by Levi Woodbury, and despatched to the emissaries of the Administration in New Hampshire.

The resolutions, then, which follow, we presume are the handiwork of the Pierce Administration, and, as such, we publish them:

"Resolved, That the Democracy of New Hampshire adhere as firmly as ever to the platform adopted at the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore, on which the last Presidential election was so triumphantly fought and won; and that we shall preserve with increased fervor our former devotion to the Constitution, Union, and our unabated hostility to all parties and all factions that would alienate the affections of the people from those great bonds of our national liberty and prosperity."

tegrity enough to resist such appeals. And, at a packed Convention in that State, as we have seen, the Nebraska Bill, its Principle, and the Policy it indicates, have been endorsed in the strongest terms.

Since then, State Conventions of Administration supporters, calling themselves the Democratic party, have been held in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. That of New Hampshire was held at Concord, on the 15th, and we copy the resolutions adopted, as they probably embody the plan of the Administration for restoring harmony among its followers. It is no new thing that resolutions should be prepared at Washington, and sent to the States for adoption. The resolutions of the New Hampshire Legislature, or State Democratic Convention, in 1845, in relation to Texas, were drafted, we are told, by John C. Calhoun, transcribed by Levi Woodbury, and despatched to the emissaries of the Administration in New Hampshire.

The resolutions, then, which follow, we presume are the handiwork of the Pierce Administration, and, as such, we publish them:

"Resolved, That the Democracy of New Hampshire adhere as firmly as ever to the platform adopted at the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore, on which the last Presidential election was so triumphantly fought and won; and that we shall preserve with increased fervor our former devotion to the Constitution, Union, and our unabated hostility to all parties and all factions that would alienate the affections of the people from those great bonds of our national liberty and prosperity."

"Resolved, That the right to regulate their domestic institutions for themselves within their own limits, ought to be enjoyed by the people of the States and Territories of the country; that the Compromise acts of 1850 substantially recognized the justice of this principle, which has at length been made uniform in its operations in the recent action of Congress in passing the bill for the organization of Kansas and Nebraska."

"Resolved, That the administration of Franklin Pierce has been directed by high, pure, and national considerations, and has exhibited proofs of a wise, liberal, and patriotic policy; that it has shown itself true to the great principle of Jefferson and the early leaders of the Democracy of the country; and therefore we continue to repose in it the most unlimited confidence, and entertain for it, and especially for its distinguished head, the warmest feelings of attachment and regard."

There was another resolution, which has slipped from our table, declaring that whatever differences of opinion may have existed among Democrats concerning the expediency of the Bill, when under discussion, now that it is passed, all should acquiesce in it, &c.

The leaders in Vermont, at the State Administration Convention that met on the 21st June, secured the adoption of the same resolutions, substantially. We have at hand now only a synopsis of them, given by a Democratic correspondent of the New York Evening Post, as follows:

"The resolutions, all of any significance, go to establish the following positions:

"1st. The unshaken confidence of the Convention in the administration of Gen. Pierce."

"2d. The non-intervention principle, asserted by the Compromises of 1850 and carried out in the Nebraska bill, is a true Democratic doctrine."

"3d. But, owing to difference of opinion, the support of the Nebraska bill not to be made a test among Democrats, but all to be left free to enjoy and express their opinions of the measure, without affecting their party standing."

"4th. A condemnation of sectional issues, and of the platform of the recent Whig Convention."

Parties in Maine have been so disorganized by the Temperance Question, that it requires considerable circumspection to define them.

The real Democracy, as we have already announced, met in Convention on the 7th inst., adopted Temperance and Anti-Slavery resolves, and nominated a candidate for the office of Governor, representing the policy they indicated. On the 15th, the "Wild Cats," schismatics from the Democracy, met in State Convention in Portland, resolved against the Maine Law, and in favor of the Nebraska Bill, and made their nominations accordingly. On the 21st, the Hunkers, Administration men proper, assembled in Convention at the same place, nominated Albion K. Parris for Governor, and declining to express any opinion on Temperance or the Nebraska Bill, adjourned, after having passed a single resolution as follows:

"Resolved, That this Convention do now adjourn, to meet their fellow Democrats at the polls, and elect Hon. Albion K. Parris Governor of this State for the ensuing year."

In all these States, except Maine, the leaders of what once was the Democratic Party, march boldly up to the question, endorse the Nebraska integrity, and warmly applaud an Administration, whose career, unmarked by a single Democratic measure, is stamped at every step with utter subservience to Slavery. In Maine, the leaders seek to dodge responsibility by passing no resolutions for or against the Nebraska Bill; but there can be little doubt that they have nominated a candidate committed to the Administration, and that they intend to acquiesce in the outrage inflicted on the free States.

A correspondent of the New York Tribune, writing from Washington, June 25th, says of Mr. Parris:

"It is generally believed here, that when he was in this city a few weeks ago, he spoke approvingly of that measure, and took credit to himself for having discouraged a meeting of the citizens of Portland to protest against it."

So much for Conventional action, as indicating the policy of the leaders of the party that elected the nullifier of the Missouri Compromise.

Let us glance at their policy, as disclosed in the conduct of their prominent journals. We have nothing to say of the "ox that knoweth its owner, or of the ass that loveth its master's crib"—nothing of that tribe of creatures that peddle the praises of the President, for a price. Our business is with respectable journalists, who have shown their respect for Principle by condemning the Nebraska Bill, but may now show their regard for Party, by inculcating or practicing acquiescence.

The Augusta (Me.) Age is one of these, and represents the Hunkers of that State, who have nominated Mr. Parris. It condemned the Nebraska Bill, but, on the ground, chiefly, that it violated the Baltimore Platform, and re-opened the agitation of Slavery. Still more lately it denounced the Washington Union, for insisting upon adhesion to the Bill, as a test of Democracy. Commenting some time since on its

tegrity enough to resist such appeals. And, at a packed Convention in that State, as we have seen, the Nebraska Bill, its Principle, and the Policy it indicates, have been endorsed in the strongest terms.

Since then, State Conventions of Administration supporters, calling themselves the Democratic party, have been held in New Hampshire, Vermont, and Maine. That of New Hampshire was held at Concord, on the 15th, and we copy the resolutions adopted, as they probably embody the plan of the Administration for restoring harmony among its followers. It is no new thing that resolutions should be prepared at Washington, and sent to the States for adoption. The resolutions of the New Hampshire Legislature, or State Democratic Convention, in 1845, in relation to Texas, were drafted, we are told, by John C. Calhoun, transcribed by Levi Woodbury, and despatched to the emissaries of the Administration in New Hampshire.

The resolutions, then, which follow, we presume are the handiwork of the Pierce Administration, and, as such, we publish them:

"Resolved, That the Democracy of New Hampshire adhere as firmly as ever to the platform adopted at the National Democratic Convention at Baltimore, on which the last Presidential election was so triumphantly fought and won; and that we shall preserve with increased fervor our former devotion to the Constitution, Union, and our unabated hostility to all parties and all factions that would alienate the affections of the people from those great bonds of our national liberty and prosperity."

"Resolved, That the right to regulate their domestic institutions for themselves within their own limits, ought to be enjoyed by the people of the States and Territories of the country; that the Compromise acts of 1850 substantially recognized the justice of this principle, which has at length been made uniform in its operations in the recent action of Congress in passing the bill for the organization of Kansas and Nebraska."

## GREAT DEBATE IN THE SENATE.

Senate, Monday, June 26, 1854.

The Boston meeting being up.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee, said that he had no design to call in question the motives of the Senator who had presented the petition. He had no fault to find with the exercise of the right of petition. It was the undoubted right of every citizen, and one to which he would give every latitude. He would go so far as to say that he believed it was the right of his Saviour, Majesty, even to send up a petition to that Court which he had insulted, and from which he had been banished. But it was by no means and objects that petitions were to be judged. So, if, in sending up that petition, he was actuated by a purpose of mischief, or was hypocritical in his prayer, he deserved a deeper infamy than that to which he had already been consigned. If this petition now before the Senate bore witness to proper motives, and proper purposes, it is entitled to all respect. If it be sent up for the purpose of mischief, and to produce strife, then it deserved the contempt of every good man. This was not the first petition of this character sent here; and, had this come unattended with striking circumstances, giving it the color of treason, he would not have noticed it. But it came here with circumstances tending to show that it is part of the plan of operations of those with whom agitation and repeal are watchwords. He had seen, already, one attempt made to give practical effect to the prayer of this petition, and it had only found four Senators who would give sanction of their names to its unholy purpose. It was said that these petitioners were ready to sign the repeal of the Nebraska bill and the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. He did not believe it. It was the result of a combination of those willing to take part in any scheme to break down the Constitution of the United States, and place the South under degradation and humiliation. It came from a city where the laws were not enforced at distance; where the temple of justice was surrounded by an armed mob, to prevent the execution of constitutional duty; where treason stalked broadly through the streets at noonday, and where the officers of the law were butchered. The petition came from such a people and from such a place, following immediately upon these events. Was he not right in supposing this petition, put up at such a time, had in view no consideration of public interest? It came from Boston, where the day of the first and the last martyrs in the country's cause, Warren and Batchelder, were now mingled together.

The orator then called attention to an Address, published in the *Intelligencer* of the 22d inst., said to have been adopted at a meeting of the members of Congress opposed to the Nebraska bill. The simultaneous appearance of this document with this petition might induce the belief that, like birds of omen and perturbed spirits, they desired companionship in publicity as well as in sentiment. The meeting which adopted this extraordinary Address was most irregular. No man save the three whose names were attached to the Address had been bold enough to avow his connection with it. He would rejoice if they had the manliness to come forward and let the country know who they were who had given sanction to this paper. It was to be expected they would do so, and that no man would be deterred enough to screen himself from responsibility by avoiding any publicity of his connection with the meeting. It was a most carefully prepared paper. It did not say the members of Congress opposed to the Nebraska bill, nor did it say a part of them, but it said a meeting composed of members of Congress. Who were they? How many were they? The Address was signed by three persons. It may be said that these were all who were there. He had known meetings heralded to the country as large and respectable, composed only of a chairman and secretaries, and whose only claim to largeness consisted in the physical proportions of the chairman. So far as the chairman of this meeting was considered, it might be considered a large meeting. He would not believe that any one member from the South would give the sanction of his name to the statements contained in that Address.

The orator then read the Address and its arguments upon the encroachments by the slave power; by its acquisitions and the designed extension of its area upon the adoption of the Missouri Compromise and the Compromise of 1850, and the repeal of the former. &c. He commented upon the same with great severity of language. He said he was happy in the belief that not one Southern man attended the meeting. After reading the Address, he suggested to its unknown author to abandon the barren field of political literature, and turn his thoughts to the richer field of the world of fiction. The author of the Address did fair to rival the writer of the Arabian Nights' Entertainment, Eugene Sue, Paul de Kock, and many others, who were so prolific in works of fiction. He had never seen a production which contained in so few words so much fiction and pure imagination as this Address. The Address charged the South with the crime of having taken up other designs of making the Territories slave States; with annexing half a dozen States of Mexico, and making them slave; with planting slavery on the Amazon; with augmenting its power by the acquisition of Cuba and Dominica, and in time reducing the North to abject submission. He called for the author of this accusation. He would not attempt to follow the Senator from Tennessee, for, like a hero of antiquity, it could be said of that Senator, "three had he slain his foe, and thrice he slew the slain." He sincerely hoped the people of the North were not to be intimidated or enjoined into an abandonment of those great principles of freedom which they had so long been devoted to. He hoped there would be a noble and successful struggle.

Mr. SUMNER said that he would be glad to agree with his colleague as to the character of the memorialists. Among them were those who had acquiesced in the Compromise measures of 1850—there were also those engaged in great mercantile interests. It was that great interest which, in the history of England, twice checked the humane efforts of Wilberforce to break up the African slave trade. It was the same great interest which, from sordid motives, had in the Constitution of the United States kept for twenty years the same heaven-offending traffic from the judgment of the American people. He had spoken against the Fugitive Slave Law here and elsewhere. He was free to avow it. In so doing, he would not draw himself upon the judgment of a Senate fresh from the passage of the Nebraska bill, but would throw himself upon the judgment of his country and his God. He then read numerous extracts from the former speeches on this law, and avowed again the sentiments therein expressed. He referred to the sentiments expressed in Faneuil Hall, by Ois. Adams, and others, preceding the Revolution, in which they held that resistance to slavery was obedience to God. A short distance from the sacred edifice, said he, and between it and the Court-house, where the disgusting rites of sacrificing a human being to slavery were lately performed, was the spot which was first moistened by American blood in resisting slavery, and among the first victims was a colored person. Near Boston are Concord and Lexington, where that resistance was